IV. Apart from this fallacy of principle, I submit that all the *descriptive* names of styles are also, in the present state of our knowledge, either false, insufficient, redundant, or inconsistent. Thus, "Lancet style" is all four; false because there are no forms in it truly resembling a lancet (or even an outline of one, except reversed like Wyld's globe, solid for void and void for solid); insufficient because these lancet-fitting vacuities are as common in any later style as in the one meant; redundant, because such openings are not necessary to the style; and inconsistent, because it bears no relation to any other name in use, for we have no pen-knife, sword, or carving-knife style, or any other named on the cutleresque system. So, too, with "Decorated," which, I need not stop to show, is wrong in all four ways; every writer seeming now to avoid it, as having the utmost faultiness that any word ever used as a name can be conceived to have. Yet we have seen an exact parallel in the "Florid Gothic," *florid* having just as much connection with a style or period as *stupid* has. Any style may be undecorated, decorated, or florid. In the town of Ely alone, there are equally florid examples of every one from the Norman downwards. Our "Geometrical," again, sins nearly as much on all four points, and is no name; the style being nowise *more* geometrical than styles in general, either of architecture or of mere tracery. It is utterly indefensible unless we can distinguish all other styles from it as "Arithmetical" or "Algebraical," or having some other quality *not* geometrical. So also "Flowing" is inconsistent, unless opposed to some such term as "Stopped" or "Discontinuous;" and it is, therefore, only applicable to the whole of the later Gothic collectively (Freeman's "Continuous Gothic"), including "Perpendicular" and Tudor. "Flowing Curvilinear" and "Flowing Rectilinear" might serve as sub-divisions of the Flowing; but "Curvilinear" alone, as now applied, is egregiously false, even as confined to window tracery, this style actually admitting *some* straight lines where the previous style admitted *none* (as you will see on comparing the two transept ends of Southwark). As for "Rectilinear," it has only (but to a peculiar degree) the radical fault common to all the rest, of applying to window-tracery alone (a secondary and quite non-essential feature); and "Perpendicular" adds to this the inconsistency of corresponding to no negative, no "Oblique-angled" or "Non-perpendicular" style.

V. Thus while the original and admirable systematizer of our styles, Rickman, unfortunately chose for the two later of his four periods, names barbarous and inadequate; his more lettered imitators and retailers, who ought to have known better, instead of mending, have extended the false principle of them to the whole nomenclature; and this without the plea of originality, and with the affectation of altering names for the sake of change, needlessly, and generally for the worse.

VI. Assuming then that all these fallacies are inseparable from the false principle of names describing internal peculiarities, I submit the following as a mode of superseding them with the least possible innovation on those left by the excellent and laborious Rickman:—First, for the large and primary divisions (whose number seems to me very unimportant), retaining his Norman and Early English, as right in principle (and the latter peculiarly good from its correspondence with the rise of our language), I replace the two others thus:—As his "Decorated" period is just included in the reigns of the three successive and long-lived Edwards, and as the other Edwards' reigns are scattered, and evidently too short to have any peculiar style proper to them, I cannot see any chance of misconception if I substitute for this "Decorated English," the term Edwardian (which further dispenses with the qualification *English*, since in no other kingdom has this been a regal name). Then, as his "Perpendicular English" assumed its complete form exactly at the accession of the house of Lancaster (for Westminster-Hall, the last work under Richard II., is hardly complete "Perpendicular"), I can see no impropriety in calling this style Lancastrian, even though it did *grow up* before their accession, and extend after their fall, through the few and troublous years of the York dynasty, in which very little was built. Thus we are brought down to the Tudor style, already an established name. I thus interfere in no way with the duration allotted to each primary style, only substituting the two names, Edwardian for "Decorated," and Lancastrian for "Perpendicular."

Further, with these two innovations alone we can distinguish more transitional and subordinate divisions than in any system I have seen, as the following table will show. Reigns are substituted for dates, as quite definite enough and more easily remembered.

REIGNS.	NAMES HITHERTO USED.	NAMES PROPOSED.	
All before Henry II.	Norman	*Collectively*	Norman.
Henry II.	Early Transitional	PURE-ENGLISH	Mixed Norman. And
Cœur de Lion	Late Transitional	*Divisible into*	Semi-English.
John	Early English	*Collectively*	Nascent English or Joannian. Mid-Early English.
Henry III.	Lancet, &c.	EARLY ENGLISH	
Ditto, later	Transition to Decorated.	*Divisible into*	And Semi-Edwardian.
Edward I.	Decorated, Flowing	*Collectively*	Early Edwardian.
Edward II.	Geometrical	EDWARDIAN	Mid-Edwardian.
Edward III.	Curvilinear, &c.	*Divisible into*	Late Edwardian.
Richard II.	Transition to Perpendicular	Semi-Lancastrian.	
Henry IV.	Perpendicular-English	*Collectively*	Early.
Henry V.	Rectilinear	LANCASTER-ENGLISH	Middle.
Henry VI.	English After-Gothic, &c.	*Divisible, if necessary, into*	Late. And After-Lancastrian.
Edward IV., Edward V.			
Richard III., Henry VII.	Early Tudor	TUDOR-ENGLISH; or Proper Tudor.	
Henry VIII.	Tudor Gothic		
Edward VI., Mary	Late Tudor	TUDOR-ITALIAN; or Mixed Tudor.	
Elizabeth	Elizabethan		

It may assist the memory to observe that all the Richards' reigns are periods of rapid and marked transition; the first from Norman to English, the second from Edwardian to Lancastrian, and the third from debased Lancastrian to Tudor (a change much overlooked, but very decided in expression, even where the features are few and similar).

Mitford uses the term "Plantagenet Architecture" for the Early English; but it is remarkable that this dynasty was just long enough to embrace the four main varieties; the earliest buildings under Henry II. being pure Norman, and the latest, under Richard II., Perpendicular.

The division of such a series into styles has been well compared by Mr. Scott to the division of the spectrum into colours, whose number is almost arbitrary. Yet there are periods of comparative settlement or repose, separated by others of rapid change, and these appear to me to be somehow connected with a certain kind of *renovation* or return to earlier principles, to greater simplicity and boldness, which took place at least three times. This is most striking at the end of the Early English period, when its small and multiplied mouldings were exchanged for few and bold ones; but a similar retrogression is, I think, observable at the previous transition from Norman to English, and very decidedly at the change from Edwardian to Lancastrian, which in its earliest phase is far more artistic and more dignified in aspect than the previous "Decorated" of Edward III. Every style in this country grew, towards its close, frittered, thin, and poor, and the rectification of this came only with a new style. This tendency is national: our fashions, whenever left to themselves, exhibit it to this day.

The Lancastrian is the last and worst of *styles*, the first and best of *fashions*; for fashion, the great antagonist of art, began her tyranny in this country long before the "Renaissance," but on no part of the continent till after that change,—in Islam not to this day. The most hopeful effect I have heard of in the Hyde Park Exhibition has been its setting some people wondering how it is that vulgarity seems a thing unknown in Mahometan and Asiatic art (not, however, in Chinese). They may take it for granted that it is wholly unknown in decoration whose object is *beauty*, and wholly pervades that whose object is "respectability," i. e. wealth-mimicry,—where the motive and purpose are so base that it has to change its guise and very name as often as any one on the police books (from fashion to gentility, respectability, decency, character, style, &c.). I challenge their respectabilityships to make anything that will keep a week without stinking, if they can.

But, to return, though I submit that descriptive names are wrong when applied to styles of an art as a whole, observe that this nowise interferes with their use to express the varieties of any particular branch of the art (as in painting to express varieties of composition, lighting, colouring, &c.; in music, varieties of time, &c.; or, in our art, varieties of arcuation, fenestration, &c.), and the nomenclature of this kind which I would suggest in the case of *tracery*, shall, if you have no objection, be the subject of another letter.

E. L. GARBETT.

BITS OF THE GREAT EXHIBITION.

Morrell's Abutments and Tension Rods.—In Class VII. close to the large hydraulic press on the north side of the nave, at the east end, Mr. G. F. Morrell (a name known in connection with good black-lead pencils), exhibits iron abutments and tension rods for wide arches. The abutments are of cast iron, the rods of wrought iron, and one object of the patentee is to induce the substitution of flat brick arches thus held together, for the wooden or cast iron bressummers now used for shop-fronts. The principle, our readers know, is not exactly a new one, but it is here put into a readily obtainable shape, and should come into use. Messrs. Glover, of Drury-lane, are the agents.

Granite from Sweden.—In the area outside the Great Exhibition, at the east end, is a large cross of granite from Sweden. The material is very compact and fine grained, and apparently well adapted for architectural purposes. We are not aware at what cost it could be obtained in England.

Effect of the Collection.—A "Working Man" addresses us as follows:—"In last week I paid my seventh and last visit to the Great Exhibition, now so soon to be closed. Then, and on each previous occasion, I was greatly pleased to observe that all the many thousands by whom I was surrounded—high and low, young and old, foreign and native visitors—appeared to be as much gratified and delighted as myself; and I could not help reflecting again and again on the manifestation of *good nature and kindly feeling* displayed by all around me, and was led to inquire into the cause of an effect universally apparent. To my mind it appeared that the *magnificent spectacle* open to the view of all, and composed of such a multitudinous variety of beautiful, interesting, and useful objects, was so impressive and so excitive of all the better feelings of our nature, that thereby all the baser passions, angry feelings, and irritation, which under other circumstances might be expected to show themselves, were for the time being completely subdued. If that be the true source of such good effects, then I am warranted in asserting, for that reason, among many others which might be adduced, that the People's Palace ought not to be taken down, but rather kept up to inclose in its own light and graceful way some *great sight*, some

To learn about PDF Compression and OCR visit our website